

produced at from 30 to 40 cents a bushel. That statement was dealt with this afternoon by the hon. member for Acadia; therefore I am not going to say much about it. Getting down to facts, which is what we ought to deal with, I shall discuss for a moment a district having a yield of 13½ bushels. I believe that is what we should consider, because 12½ bushels has been the average yield in western Canada for the past ten years. The statement of Professor Hope, already quoted, states on page 151 that:

From 1918 to 1930 these two areas each had an average yield of 13.6 bushels of wheat per acre. On the basis of those yields the cost per bushel of wheat sold is 71 cents for the half-section farm, and 50 cents for the section farm. The estimated debt now amounts to about \$20 per acre of crop land or \$40 per acre of wheat, or the interest charge at 6 per cent amounts to 20 cents per bushel of wheat sold. For the half-section farm the cost plus interest on estimated debt is 91 cents per bushel. For the section farm the cost plus interest is about 70 cents per bushel of wheat sold.

On February 27 last the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) moved a resolution advocating 95 cents a bushel at the local elevator. This statement, I believe, bears out that price right to the cent, because here we are given interest at six per cent—it is actually seven per cent or higher—and a little higher yield than we have been getting during the past ten years; so that an estimate of twenty-five cents per bushel for wheat grown on western farms is as close as you can reasonably get to the average cost for interest.

Then in case anyone should say the wages we pay on the farms of the west are too high I should like to give the figures in this connection, taken from the monthly bulletin of agricultural statistics for February, 1929. These are government figures, not mine:

Manitoba Saskatchewan Alberta  
(cents per day)

|              |    |    |    |
|--------------|----|----|----|
| 1934.. . . . | 44 | 45 | 52 |
| 1935.. . . . | 47 | 51 | 55 |
| 1936.. . . . | 52 | 55 | 60 |
| 1937.. . . . | 59 | 55 | 65 |
| 1938.. . . . | 60 | 60 | 70 |

For female help in the house we find the average for those years to be 30 cents a day for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and 36 cents per day for Alberta. Perhaps we might compare these with the wages paid in other lines of industry. I do not think it is necessary for me to quote those. Here in Ottawa we find civil servants starting in at \$52 a month, out of which they have to pay board, of course, and for which they work 6½ hours a day. On the farm 13 hours seems a short day, and many of the help have to work 14 and 15 hours per day, and in some cases more. We

had a royal commission, which plastered a little more white wash on the grain exchange. Possibly in return for some favours during the 1935 session, we find one learned gentleman being paid \$200 a day, with a living allowance of \$20 per day in addition. Those salaries and allowances had to be paid by the farmers who were growing the wheat and paying the low wages I have just quoted.

To come back for a moment to the cost of growing wheat, according to bulletin No. 159 of the Department of Agriculture, issued in 1932, the average cost of growing wheat was 95 cents per bushel at the experimental farm. Major Strange, in an address on Canada's wheat problem, said:

I have averaged up the price of all wheat produced for sixty-two years, and I find it comes out to \$1.14 for No. 2 Northern at Winnipeg.

But, while that average has been received, at the present time perhaps seventy-five per cent of the western wheat producers are bankrupt, and if this policy is put into effect we may find that percentage very considerably increased in the very near future. The 80 cent rate which the Bracken conference recommended, which request is endorsed by myself and the group to which I belong, with an average yield of 12 bushels to the acre, which is just half a bushel below the average for the past ten years—I left it at twelve bushels because I am not so good at figuring—would give, at the local elevator, the following returns per acre:

|                        | Dollars<br>per acre |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| No. 1 northern.. . . . | 7.44                |
| No. 2 northern.. . . . | 7.08                |
| No. 3 northern.. . . . | 6.48                |
| No. 4 northern.. . . . | 5.88                |
| No. 5.. . . .          | 5.16                |
| No. 6.. . . .          | 4.92                |
| Feed wheat.. . . .     | 4.92                |

That is ten cents a bushel more than we are offered under this legislation, and perhaps we will get that ten cents after the government thinks it over for a while. In that connection I should like to quote from a bulletin issued by the Searle Grain Company under date of April 19, 1939, which states:

In other words it means that a farming family of five, operating a half section—

That is the unit the Minister of Agriculture advocates.

—would have to receive during a year a bare minimum of \$887.24 in order to be able to stay on their farm, and to operate it with even a low standard of living. For the standard of living to be what might be termed satisfactory the income would have to be considerably higher than \$887.24.